

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JIANGBIN LONG,
Plaintiffs,
v.
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., *et al.*
Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-02402 CV (KESx)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
DISMISSED WITHOUT
PREJUDICE FOR LACK OF
SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

Federal courts are courts of “limited jurisdiction,” possessing “only that power authorized by the Constitution and statute[.]” *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994); U.S. Const. art. III, § 2, cl. 1. District courts are presumed to lack jurisdiction unless the contrary appears affirmatively from the record. *See DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno*, 547 U.S. 332, 342 n. 3 (2006). Additionally, federal courts have an obligation to examine jurisdiction *sua sponte* before proceeding to the merits of a case. *See Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil Co.*, 526 U.S. 574, 583 (1999). When a district court determines that there is no subject matter jurisdiction in a non-removal case, dismissal without prejudice is appropriate. *See Wasson v. Brown*, 316 F. App’x 663, 664 (9th Cir. 2009); *Parker v. Ebay*, No. CV 24-1863-JFW (JCx), 2024 WL 1484598, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 5, 2024).

1 Plaintiff Xiangbin Long's ("Plaintiff") First Amended Complaint (Doc. # 33,
2 "FAC") does not establish jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship. "The district
3 courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy
4 exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between –
5 citizens of different States[.]" 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). Plaintiff has not alleged that the
6 amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interests and
7 costs. The amount in controversy is not "facially evident" from the pleading, and
8 "[c]onclusory allegations as to the amount in controversy are insufficient." *Matheson v.*
9 *Progressive Specialty Ins. Co.*, 319 F.3d 1089, 1090-91 (9th Cir. 2003). Nor can Plaintiff
10 establish jurisdiction based on a federal question, as the FAC includes only two claims,
11 both based on California law. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1331 ("The district courts shall have
12 original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treatises of
13 the United States.").

14 Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing only,
15 within fourteen (14) days from the date of this Order, why this action should not be
16 dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Responses shall be
17 limited to ten (10) pages in length.

18

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20

21 DATED: 7/7/25


HON. CYNTHIA VALENZUELA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

22

23

24

25

26

27

28